



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

SHERIDAN ROSS PC  
1560 BROADWAY  
SUITE 1200  
DENVER, CO 80202

**COPY MAILED**

MAY 05 2005

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Van Doren et al.  
Application No. 10/666,433  
Filed: September 18, 2003  
Attorney Docket No. 3944-13-CIP

:  
:  
: DECISION ON PETITION  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)  
:

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), filed April 11, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications set forth in the amendment filed concurrently with the instant petition.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant petition still does not comply with item (1) above.

A reference to add the above-noted, prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification has been included in a concurrently filed amendment. However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, *supra* at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter

barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. *See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).*

The amendment submitted with the instant petition on April 11, 2005 is still not acceptable as drafted. The last sentence in the amendment, beginning with "the entire disclosure of these prior amendments..." is still perceived as an incorporation by reference statement and should be deleted in its entirety. Also, the format for deleting subject matter, as stated in 37 CFR 1.121, is as follows:

The text of any deleted matter must be shown by strike-through except that double brackets placed before and after the deleted characters may be used to show deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters.

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a substitute amendment<sup>1</sup> deleting the incorporation by reference statement, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), is required.


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                     Customer Window located at:  
  
                                    U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                                    Customer Service Window Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                        (703) 872-9306  
                                    ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Paralegal Liana Chase at (571) 272-3206.

  
Frances Hicks  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

---

<sup>1</sup> Note 37 CFR 1.121